

REMARKS

Upon entry of the claim amendments, Claims 1 and 3-12 will be all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 1 and 4-8 have been amended to depend from Claim 3.

Claims 9 and 10 have been rewritten as independent claims, including all the recitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

No new matter has been added.

Applicant notes with appreciation the examiner's indication of allowable subject matter at page 4 of the final Office Action.

In light of Applicant having rewritten Claims 9 and 10 as independent claims, Applicant requests that they be indicated as allowed in the next communication to Applicant.

I. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Referring to page 3 of the final Action, Claims 1, 3-8, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

In response, Applicant points out that Claims 3 and 11-12 should not have been included in the §112, second paragraph, rejection.

Claim 3 is an independent claim directed to a golf ball having a coating obtained by curing a paint composition. Claim 3 recites that the paint composition comprises an aqueous resin having photo-curable functional groups in a molecule, a photoinitiator, and a crosslinker. Each of Claims 11-12 depends from Claim 3.

As indicated at page 3 of the final Action, the §112, second paragraph, rejection is based on the recitation "carbodiimide base crosslinker or an ethyleneimine base crosslinker," which is not included in Claim 3.

RULE 116 AMENDMENT
U.S. Appln. No. 10/662,385

Therefore, Claims 3 and 11-12 should have been identified as allowed, and Applicant requests that they be identified as such in the next communication to Applicant.

As for Claim 1, it previously recited that the crosslinker is a carbodiimide base crosslinker or an ethyleneimine base crosslinker. The Examiner asserts that it is not clear what kind of “base” is intended to be present.

The description at, e.g., page 5, lines 12-23, of the specification makes clear that Applicant intended to recite “wherein the crosslinker is a carbodiimide-based crosslinker or an ethyleneimine-based crosslinker.” Claims 1 has been amended accordingly. Claims 9 and 10, which previously recited a carbodiimide base crosslinker and an ethyleneimine base crosslinker, respectively, have also been amended accordingly.

For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the §112 rejection is requested.

II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,352,805 (“Taylor”).

In response, Applicant points out that Claims 1 and 4-8 have been amended to depend from Claim 3. Claim 3 was not included in the present rejection.

Withdrawal of the §102 rejection based on Taylor is requested.

III. CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

RULE 116 AMENDMENT
U.S. Appln. No. 10/662,385

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860


WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "L. Raul Tamayo", written over a horizontal line.

L. Raul Tamayo
Registration No. 47,125